DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 754 CE 041 061

TITLE	A Study of Driver Education in Texas as Reported by the State Board of Education. Submitted to the Governor, Lt. Governor and the Sixty-Ninth Legislature. House Concurrent Resolution 127.
INSTITUTION	Texas Education Agency, Austin.; Texas State Board of Education, Austin.
PUB DATE	Jan 85
NOTE	31p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Curriculum Development; *Driver Education; High Schools; Program Design; *Program Development; Secondary Education; Secondary School Curriculum; State Aid; State Programs; *Statewide Planning; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

A study was undertaken to determine how driver education courses in Texas schools can be designed to reach maximum effectiveness for a maximum number of eligible new drivers. The two-phased, classroom instruction plus an "in-car" practicum were found to be the type of driver education commonly offered. A consensus description of a quality driver education program was developed that outlined the curriculum (topics and suggested number of class and laboratory hours), graduation credit, teacher certification, supervision, and evaluation. Three alternatives for providing state-level funding to school districts for driver education were suggested: semester program (classroom only), comprehensive semester program (classroom and in-car instruction), and minimum program. Pre- and post-driver education experiences and controls were recommended. The requirement of maintaining a minimum grade-point average as a prerequisite to receiving driver education was considered and rejected. Recommendations made for a comprehensive driver education program covered curriculum teacher training, classroom and behind-the-wheel instruction, credit for graduation, grade-point average prerequisites, state-level funding, post-driver training experiences and controls, supervision of local driver education programs, and evaluation. (Appendixes provide a description of the current driver education program, an outline of a comprehensive driver education curriculum, and driver education instructor training recommended course content.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED254754

State Board of Education

A Study of Driver Education in Texas As Reported by the State Board of Education

Submitted to the Governor, Lt. Governor
and
The Sixty-Ninth Legislature

House Concurrent Resolution 127
January 1985

After the original free distribution to authorized institutions, additional copies may be purchased for $1.00 by contacting the Publications Distribution Office, Texas Education Agency; however, with the increasing demand for educational material, the supply at times may be exhausted.

This Texas Education Agency publication is not copyrighted; any or all sections may be duplicated.

January 1985

CE041061

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L Kemp

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

State Board Of Education

201 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 475-4318/3271

Jon Brumley, Chairman
Fort Worth, District 11

Rebecca Canning, Vice Chairman
Waco, District 9

Emmett J. Conrad, M.D., Secretary
Dallas, District 13

Volly C. Bastine, Jr., J.D.
Houston, District 4

Mary Helen Berlanga
Corpus Christi, District 2

Carolyn Honea Crawford, Ph.D.
Beaumont, District 7

Charles W. Duncan, Jr.
Houston, District 6

Paul C. Dunn, D.D.S.
Levelland, District 15

Maria Elena A. Flood
El Paso, District 1

William V. McBride, Gen.
(USAF, Retired)
San Antonio, District 5

Geraldine Miller
Dallas, District 12

Pete Morales, Jr.
Devine, District 3

John Mack Prescott, Ph.D.
College Station, District 10

Katherine Pearcy Raines
Cleburne, District 14

Jack Strong
Longview, District 8

W. N. Kirby, Ph.D.
Interim Commissioner of Education

December 8, 1984

To the Honorable Governor of Texas, Lt. Governor,
and Sixty-Ninth Legislature:

House Concurrent Resolution 127 directed the State Board of Education in cooperation with the Texas Department of Public Safety and appropriate interim committees of the 68th Legislature to undertake a study of the problems of providing effective training for all new drivers in Texas. The study was assigned to the House Committee on Transportation and the Senate Committee on Education.

That study has been completed and is submitted to the 69th Legislature in accordance with provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 127. The recommendations are designed to strengthen the curriculum, teacher training, and pre- and post-driver education experiences for students.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Brumley

Jon Brumley, Chairman
State Board of Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

(State Board for Vocational Education)

JON BRUMLEY, Fort Worth
Chairman of the State Board of Education
District 11

REBECCA CANNING, Waco
Vice Chairman of the State Board of Education
District 9

EMMETT J. CONRAD, Dallas
Secretary of the State Board of Education
District 13

Board Members

VOLLY C. BASTINE, JR., Houston
District 4

MARY HELEN BERLANGA, Corpus Christi
District 2

CAROLYN HONEA CRAWFORD, Beaumont
District 7

CHARLES W. DUNCAN, JR., Houston
District 6

PAUL C. DUNN, Levelland
District 15

MARIA ELENA A. FLOOD, El Paso
District 1

WILLIAM V. McBRIDE, San Antonio
District 5

GERALDINE MILLER, Dallas
District 12

PETE MORALES, JR., Devine
District 3

JOHN MACK PRESCOTT, College Station
District 10

KATHERINE PEARCY RAINES, Cleburne
District 14

JACK STRONG, Longview
District 8

W. N. KIRBY, Interim Commissioner of Education
(Interim Executive Officer of the State Board of Education)

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 127
Sixty-Eighth Texas Legislature

WHEREAS, Driving a motor vehicle is important for occupational and social reasons for the majority of adults in Texas, but deaths, injuries, and economic losses resulting from traffic accidents are a major problem throughout this state and nation; and

WHEREAS, Persons with a good driver education background have been shown to be safer drivers; and

WHEREAS, Surveys have shown that more than 80 percent of parents and school officials believe that driver education programs should be offered in public schools; and

WHEREAS, The lack of adequate state funding has prohibited schools from offering free driver education programs to all students who wish to enroll in such courses; and

WHEREAS, Students who are unable to enroll in the courses not only are unable to obtain early license privileges, but also are denied certain insurance benefits; and

WHEREAS, The press of business during a legislative session makes adequate study of the available alternatives relating to provision of high-quality driver education programs difficult, but such a study should be made; now therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, the Senate concurring, that the 68th Legislature hereby direct the State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Texas Department of Public Safety and appropriate interim committees of the 68th Legislature, to undertake a study of the problems of providing effective training for all new drivers in Texas; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the study include an investigation of pre- and post-driver education experiences and controls that may be required to enhance the effect of driver education; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board make a complete report of its findings and recommendations to the 69th Legislature when it convenes in January 1985; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That official copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded to the commissioner of the Texas Education Agency and to the director of the Texas Department of Public Safety as an expression of the sentiment of the Texas Legislature.

House Concurrent Resolution 127 Study Committee

Senator Grant Jones, represented by Mr. Ken Short

Senator Carl Parker, represented by Ms. Sally Haenelt

Senator R. L. (Bob) Vale, represented by Ms. Pam O'Conner

Representative David Cain, represented by Mr. Rush Russell

Representative Gerald Hill, represented by Ms. Vickie Goff

Inspector Robert Hulen, Department of Public Safety

Mr. Vernon Cole, Department of Public Safety

Lieutenant H. W. Statemann, Department of Public Safety

Dr. Tom Anderson, Texas Education Agency

Dr. Glenn Peavy, Texas Education Agency

Mr. Gene Wilkins, Texas Education Agency

TABLE OF CONTENTS

House Concurrent Resolution 127, Sixty-Eighth Texas Legislature. i
House Concurrent Resolution 127 Study Committee. ii

I. Introduction 1

II. Role and Responsibilities of Public Education in Providing Driver Education 4

III. A Quality Driver Education Course. 5

A. Curriculum 5

B. Course Length and Graduation Credit. 6

C. Teacher Certification. 6

D. Supervision. 6

E. Evaluation 6

IV. Alternatives for Providing Appropriate State-Level Funding to School Districts for Driver Education. 7

Alternative I. Semester Program (Classroom Only). 7

Alternative II. Comprehensive Semester Program (Classroom and In-Car Instruction). 7

Alternative III. Minimum Program. 8

V. Pre- and Post-Driver Education Experiences and Controls. 9

A. Pre-Driver Education Experience. 9

B. Post-Driver Education Experiences. 9

VI. Grade-Point Average Prerequisites. 11

VII. Recommendation 12

A. Curriculum 12

B. Teacher Training 12

C. Classroom and Behind-the-Wheel Instruction 12

D. Credit for Graduation. 13

E. Grade-Point Average Prerequisites. 13

F. State-Level Funding for Driver Education 13

G. Post-Driver Training Experiences and Controls. 13

H. Supervision of Local Driver Education Programs 13

I. Evaluation 14

Appendix A - Current Driver Education Program. 15
Appendix B - A Comprehensive Driver Education Curriculum 17
Appendix C - Driver Education Instructor Training Recommended Course Content. 21

A Study of Driver Education in Texas

I. Introduction

In 1982, traffic accidents nationwide resulted in 46,000 deaths and 1,700,000 injuries and cost $41.6 billion. In Texas, 4,271 persons were killed, 204,666 were injured, and economic losses amounted to $3.4 billion. This is an average cost of $220 for each Texas citizen.

Young people, aged 16-25, constitute 22.8 percent of the licensed drivers in Texas. Yet in 1982, they were involved in 35 percent of all fatal traffic crashes. This represents an over-involvement of 11.6 percent for all traffic accidents and 12.2 percent for fatal crashes. The introduction of new drivers onto the road is clearly a matter of serious concern.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has identified twenty areas as important for states to address in efforts to prevent traffic accidents. A quality driver education program is one of these critical components.

The 68th Texas Legislature passed House Concurrent Resolution 127 directing the State Board of Education, in cooperation with the Department of Public Safety, appropriate interim committees of the Legislature (assigned to the House Committee on Transportation, and the Senate Committee on Education), to undertake a study to determine how driver education courses in Texas schools can be designed to reach maximum effectiveness for a maximum number of eligible new drivers.

In November 1983, the State Board of Education approved an implementation plan for the HCR-127 study. The study addresses the following concerns:

- role and responsibility of public education in providing driver education
- provision of a quality driver education course for approximately 218,000 eligible students each year
- alternatives for providing appropriate state-level funding to school districts for driver education
- pre- and post-driver education experiences and controls that may be required to enhance the effect of driver education
- the advisability of requiring a minimum grade-point average in core curriculum areas as a prerequisite to receiving driver education

These concerns are addressed in sections II-VI.

The current driver education program authorized in Section 21.102, Texas Education Code, described in detail in Appendix A, consists of 44 hours of instruction (32 classroom, 6 behind-the-wheel, 6 in-car observation).

Proportions of the behind-the-wheel instruction may be substituted for with simulator or multiple-car driving range instruction.

The program is administered jointly by the Central Education Agency and the Department of Public Safety. Both certified teachers and trained paraprofessionals are involved as instructors in various phases of the programming. Local credit is given for completing the course.

There are a number of problems and concerns inherent in the current program. These concerns are:

A. The public perceives the purpose of driver education primarily as a means to obtain a license rather than an essential education program.

B. Sixty-three percent of the eligible students received driver education during 1982-83.

C. Driver education is an expensive program when compared to costs of regular education programs. The "in-car" driving phase where the pupil/teacher ratio is usually three-to-one escalates costs.

D. State-level funding for driver education was eliminated by the 68th Legislature, meeting in Special Session in June 1984. This places a burden on school districts and on parents/students who now must provide the total cost of the program.

E. Many students are discouraged from taking driver education because of the tuition fees.

F. Charging fees creates a commercial atmosphere; when students pay a fee, they expect to pass the course and get a driver's license whether or not they are ready to begin driving. The charging of a fee also places a burden on those students most likely to need, but least likely to be able to afford, driver education experiences.

G. Some students are discouraged from taking driver education because no state-level credit toward graduation is given for the course.

H. The classroom phase of instruction is not comprehensive enough, and the curriculum should be upgraded.

I. Providing the current driver education program is administratively difficult. Scheduling the classroom phase, where one teacher can deal with many students and the "in-car" phase, where the teacher deals with few students, does not allow for standard scheduling as other courses.

J. Students who enroll in driver education have received limited training in pre-driver education traffic safety concepts such as passenger, pedestrian, and bicycle safety.

K. Parents are not adequately informed of their young drivers' capabilities and limitations upon completion of driver education.

L. Because the 10 percent insurance discount for driver education graduates is in effect until age 25, young drivers are discouraged from enrolling in refresher driver improvement courses.

M. Certification requirements for driver education instructors are not comprehensive or stringent enough.

N. Some school districts do not adequately supervise or evaluate the program.

II. Role and Responsibilities of Public Education in Providing Driver Education

Historically, the role of the public schools in Texas in providing driver education to its students has been an uncertain one. Although surveys consistently report that the public supports driver education in the schools, and legislative enactments have placed responsibility for providing driver education with the public schools since 1967, full funding has not been forthcoming. In fact, the Special Session of the 68th Legislature eliminated state-level funding for driver education.

The ability to operate a motor vehicle safely is a basic life skill in modern society, and requires not only ability in driving but also adequate knowledge and proper attitudes. Public schools have the opportunity, (by virtue of their "captive audience") to make driver education accessible to almost all of the 218,000 newly-eligible drivers each year. With both the responsibility and the opportunity for basic education, the state's public schools have been viewed as a logical institution for making available some form of driver education.

Driver education has historically been considered two-phased, classroom instruction plus an "in-car" practicum. The traditional classroom instruction is consistent with the basic public education structure for delivering a general curriculum to large numbers of students. The deviation from that structure is the "in-car" phase where teacher/pupil ratios of three-to-one are required, along with significant outlays of funds for leasing or purchasing automobiles and operating costs. This function is not consistent with the basic instructional delivery design of the public schools. For this reason, the capability of the public schools to provide a comprehensive driver education program for all the approximately 218,000 newly-eligible drivers in the state each year, without sufficient funding or agreement that such instruction is basic, is questionable.

III. A Quality Driver Education Course

There is a significant amount of literature from a variety of sources and expertise identifying the skills and knowledges a person should have to be an effective driver. Further, the methods of delivery of instruction to develop those skills and knowledges are available. The literature was researched in depth along with position papers from interested organizations. What follows is a consensus description of a quality driver education program.

A. Curriculum

The driver education curriculum essential elements should be defined in writing and approved by the State Board of Education and the Department of Public Safety. The curriculum should include an in-depth study of vital topics such as the effect of alcohol on the driver, the use of occupant restraints, appropriate driving speeds, traffic laws, and emergency procedures to follow when involved in an accident. The curriculum should include the following topics according to the time allotments noted:

1. Classroom Phase (Classroom instruction should consist of a minimum of 56 hours in foundations for safe driving held prior to, or concurrent with, the laboratory phase.)

   a. The driver, passenger, and the pedestrian (4 hours)

   b. Alcohol and drugs (8 hours)

   c. The automobile and preventive maintenance (4 hours)

   d. Highway characteristics and engineering controls (2 hours)

   e. Physical laws (3 hours)

   f. Occupant protection (3 hours)

   g. Motor vehicle traffic laws (6 hours)

   h. Identify/predict/decide/execute (2 hours)

   i. Driving procedures (10 hours)

   j. Accident avoidance (3 hours)

   k. Emergency procedures and first aid for traffic accidents (5 hours)

   l. The two-wheeled vehicles in the traffic pattern (2 hours)

   m. The driver as a consumer (3 hours)

n. The national and state traffic safety programs (1 hour)

2. Laboratory Phase - Twenty-four hours of instruction should be devoted to actual driving skills presented through a combination of in-car, simulator, or multiple-car driving range instruction. A minimum of seven hours of behind-the-wheel instruction should be taken by each student. Where simulator or multiple-car driving range instruction is available, the behind-the-wheel instruction may be reduced to four hours.

B. Graduation Credit

Driver education as a full semester course should be counted as one-half unit of state elective credit

C. Teacher Certification

Driver education teachers should have a valid Texas teacher's certificate and the driver education endorsement. The driver education endorsement should require an adequate number of semester hours in driver education from a university approved to train driver education teachers. Courses should be comprehensive enough to cover all topics in the driver education curriculum (see Appendix B). A suggested organization for three three-hour courses is included in Appendix C. Teaching assistants would continue to be certified to teach in the laboratory phase of driver education by completing a 184 hour or 9 semester hour training program.

D. Supervision

The driver education program should be supervised by the principal or an instructional officer designated by the superintendent to assure that the program standards are being met.

E. Evaluation

The school district should have an evaluation plan to ensure that the students are achieving the required competencies.

IV. Alternatives for Providing Appropriate State-Level Funding to School Districts for Driver Education

School districts may provide driver education to the largest number of eligible students through one of the following alternatives.

Alternative I. Semester Program (classroom only)

All school districts would be required to provide a one-semester course consisting of driver and traffic safety education and other safety related concepts. The State Board of Education would amend Title 19, Chapter 75, Texas Administrative Code adding driver and safety education to the list of courses that districts must offer and adopt essential elements to describe the minimum course content. The course would consist of a minimum of 50 hours of driver and traffic safety education instruction with the remaining 24 hours devoted to safety related topics such as fire prevention programs, recreational safety, passenger safety, pedestrian safety, and student transportation safety. Students who successfully complete the course would receive one-half unit of elective credit counting toward state graduation and would be well prepared to take the Department of Public Safety examination to obtain the permit for driving. Laboratory instruction would not be part of the course.

Districts would have the discretion to supplement the course by providing laboratory instruction. Such instruction would be before and after school, in the summer, or through community education programs. The Standards for an Approved Course in Driver Education for Texas Schools, which ensure minimum quality for the laboratory instruction, would continue to be set by the Central Education Agency and the Department of Public Safety. Laboratory instruction would be supported by school district funds and/or student fees. Boards of trustees would develop policies determining when the laboratory instruction would be given and how it would be funded and the amount of student tuition fees. For school districts that chose not to provide the laboratory phase, the responsibility would rest with parents to instruct their children or to secure their instruction. Cost: The approximate average cost of this type of program would be $116 per student.

Alternative II. Comprehensive Semester Program (classroom and in-car instruction)

School district boards of trustees may elect to offer, in lieu of Plan I, a semester driver education course including classroom and laboratory instruction as described in Section III, pages 5 and 6. The course would consist of a minimum of 80 hours of instruction and could be taught during the regular school day or in the summer school program. Students who successfully complete the course would receive one-half unit of elective credit counting toward state graduation requirements. School districts could fund the classroom phase from their basic allotment under the Foundation School Program. Districts choosing the option would supplement the remaining program cost through local funds or student fees. Cost: The approximate average cost of this type of program would be $205 per student.

Alternative III. Minimum Programs

School districts could continue the current minimum two- or three-phase courses described in Appendix A. Students would not receive credit for graduation, but districts could award local credit. Funding for this type program would come from local district funds and/or student tuition fees.

Students would receive 32 hours of classroom; 6 hours of behind-the-wheel and 6 hours of in-car observation. If districts choose to offer simulation, students would receive 32 hours of classroom; 12 hours of simulation; 3 hours of behind-the-wheel, and 6 hours of in-car observation. Cost: The approximate average cost of this type of program would be $145 per student.

V. Pre- and Post-Driver Education Experiences and Controls

A. Pre-Driver Education Experiences

For maximum effectiveness, students need to receive instruction about traffic safety concepts from Kindergarten through Grade 8. The State Board of Education, in its recent adoption of Title 19 Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 75 Curriculum, has provided for this instruction through essential elements in health, social studies, and science. For example, in health, teachers are required to teach children to "recognize hazards in the environment, and acquire knowledge and skills needed to avoid injury and prevent accidents." In social studies, students are to learn to "accept responsibility for one's actions," "demonstrate respect for private and public property," and "follow standards of ethical and moral conduct." In science, students learn the use of skills in "drawing logical inferences, predicting outcomes and forming generalized statements." All of these contribute to the development of knowledge and attitudes which form a basis for effective driving.

B. Post-Driver Education Experiences

The full potential of driver education in leading to safe and efficient driving is not being realized at the present time, largely because many students lack vehicle handling skills needed to practice the safe driving concepts learned in the classroom. The effectiveness of driver education might be increased by delaying full traffic exposure until after basic vehicle handling and judgment skills have been mastered. The following provisions concerning parental involvement, appropriate limitations on new drivers, and continued education are needed to enhance the effectiveness of driver education.

1. When a student completes driver education, the parents/guardians should receive a comprehensive evaluation of the driving abilities of their daughter or son. The report should also give parents or guardians guidance on how to provide continued training in any areas in which the student has safe driving deficiencies. The report should be sent directly to the parents or guardians and they should be required to certify its receipt.

2. New drivers should receive their driving privileges incrementally. Schools should be encouraged to sponsor parent involvement programs that will inform parents of the value and limitations of driver education. Parents or guardians should not allow their new drivers to apply for operator's licenses until they have ridden with them and are confident they are ready for limited solo driving.

3. The Department of Public Safety should consider studying an incremental licensing plan for new drivers. In today's society, young people have many legitimate needs to drive. However,

studies have shown that most new-driver crashes are associated with recreational driving. Incremental driving plans are designed to limit the new driver's exposure to the driving environments they are capable of handling. For example, students could be prohibited from applying for their operator's license until six months after they had completed driver education.

4. State Board of Insurance should consider revising rules for providing insurance deductions for driver education graduates so that young drivers would be encouraged to enroll in a refresher driver safety course after approximately three years. (It would not be the school's responsibility to provide the course.)

VI. Grade-Point Average Prerequisites

The State Board of Education included in the study consideration of the advisability of requiring students to maintain a minimum grade-point average as a prerequisite to being eligible to receive driver education.

H.B. 72, passed during the 68th Texas Legislature, Special Session, mandated that beginning in January 1985 a student must be passing all of his/her academic classes with at least a 70 average to participate in extracurricular activities. The advantage of using such minimum grade-point requirement as a prerequisite for eligibility might increase student motivation in the academic courses. Participation in driver education is very important to many 16-year-olds. The opportunity to receive a driver's license at the age of 16, rather than waiting until age 18, along with the 10 percent insurance reduction that is given to those who complete driver education, is strong enticement.

On the other hand, there are students who attend public schools who may not be capable of the academic performance required by such a rule, and who, in fact, may not complete high school. For these students, a driver's license is almost a necessity if they are going to find jobs and function effectively in today's society. Grade restrictions may, therefore, create a hardship for the students who need the course the most.

It may also be argued that since driver education is a regular course, for which a grade and local credit are given, no special prerequisite should be necessary. No minimum grade average requirements are needed for enrollments in other courses, only for participation in extracurricular activities. If safe driving is a basic life skill that every student should have an opportunity to develop, then the driver education course should be made available as an alternative for all students and not as a reward for some.

VII. Recommendations

The problems of providing a quality driver education program for all eligible students have been identified, a review of the literature concerning quality driver education programs has been conducted, and position papers from interested organizations have been reviewed. Therefore, to provide for a comprehensive driver education program for all Texas youth, the following recommendations are made:

A. Curriculum

The curriculum should be expanded in critical areas such as the effect of alcohol on drivers and pedestrians, use of occupant restraints, appropriate driving speeds, traffic laws, and emergency procedures to follow when involved in an accident. The classroom phase should consist of a minimum of 56 hours of instruction. School districts should have the option of providing 24 additional hours of instruction in safety-related topics or in the laboratory driving phase to constitute a one semester (80 hour) class.

B. Teacher Training

Adequate preparation of teachers to organize, teach, and evaluate a quality driver education course requires more than the current six semester hours of training. The State Board of Education should continue to require that a driver education teacher possess a valid Texas teacher's certificate while raising the requirements for the driver education endorsement to no longer permit general safety courses to be taken as part of the requirement. Instructor training of nine semester hours should be comprehensive enough to cover all topics in the driver education curriculum.

The rules for the use and training of paraprofessionals remain in effect with the two following considerations:

1. The Central Education Agency should investigate the advisability of districts and education service centers training their own driver education paraprofessionals.

2. The curriculum for training driver education paraprofessionals should be reviewed and updated.

C. Classroom and Behind-the-Wheel Instruction

School districts should have flexibility as to when and what kind of driver education instruction to provide. However, courses that provide only minimum amounts of instruction may be inadequate. Therefore, it is recommended that the State Board of Education develop incentives for districts to provide no less than seven hours of behind-the-wheel instruction in two-phase programs and no less than four hours in multi-phase programs. The incentives developed should not discourage the use of driving simulators.

D. Credit for Graduation

One-half unit of credit toward state graduation requirements should be given for driver education courses that consist of at least 80 55-minute periods and include a minimum of 7 hours of behind-the-wheel instruction or 4 hours of behind-the-wheel instruction in programs including the required amounts of simulator or multiple-car driving range instruction.

E. Grade-Point Average Prerequisites

The State Board of Education should not require a minimum grade-point average in core curricular courses for participation in driver education courses.

F. State-Level Funding for Driver Education

The 68th Texas Legislature, in Special Session in June 1984, eliminated all categorical funding through the Foundation School Program, of which driver education was a part. The elimination of categorical funding does not affect school districts' authority to offer driver education. Texas Education Code Section 21.102 directs the Central Education Agency to develop a program of organized instruction in driver education and traffic safety for public school students who are 15 years of age or older. Furthermore, 19 TAC Chapter 75 authorizes driver education to be taught for local credit. Therefore, school districts may use part of their basic allotment of Foundation School Program funds to supplement the driver education program just as any other subject area. In addition, classroom and/or laboratory instruction may be funded through local funds or student tuition fees as provided under TEC Section 20.53.

G. Post-Driver Training Experiences and Controls

The State Board of Insurance should consider limiting the driver education discount to a three-year period following graduation from driver education to encourage young drivers to take refresher driver improvement courses.

The State Board of Education should require school districts to provide parents/guardians with a report of students' capabilities upon their completion of driver education. The report shall identify driving incompetencies and recommend training techniques that parents may use to provide additional training to their young drivers. The report should encourage all parents to evaluate their young drivers' abilities and release them to full driving privileges according to their skill levels and judgment abilities.

H. Supervision of Local Driver Education Programs

The Central Education Agency should increase the monitoring of local

district driver education programs and the Texas Department of Public Safety should assist by utilizing field personnel in their driver licensing and education divisions.

I. Evaluation

The Central Education Agency should develop a process that districts may use to evaluate their driver education programs and require its use.

Current Driver Education Program

A. Administration

Under Texas law, the State Board of Education and the Department of Public Safety have a dual responsibility, under the authority of the Governor, for administering the program. The Standards for an Approved Course in Driver Education for Texas Schools, which are sanctioned by both agencies, set the administrative rules for the course.

B. Curriculum

The course consists of 32 hours of classroom instruction, 6 hours of behind-the-wheel instruction, and 6 hours of in-car observation. Driving simulation instruction is allowed on a four-to-one substitution ratio for in-car instruction. (For example, 12 hours of simulation may substitute for 3 hours of in-car instruction.) Multiple-car driving range instruction may be provided on a two-to-one substitution ratio with in-car instruction. In all instances, a minimum of three hours of in-car instruction must be given. Course content, minimum instruction requirements, and administrative guidelines for each phase of instruction must conform to the state-approved curriculum guide appropriate for each phase of instruction.

C. Costs

The expense of securing cars and insurance and providing the one-to-one student-teacher ratio necessary for behind-the-wheel instruction raises the costs of instruction of driver education to levels higher than purely academic courses. Present program guidelines are developed to control the cost of driver education.

Non-degreed persons with special training are authorized to teach laboratory phases of instruction. This reduces the cost of laboratory instruction by approximately 25 percent.

The state, using federal funds from 1968 until they were discontinued in 1981, assisted school districts in the purchase of driving simulators. There are approximately 110 of these driving simulator systems now in use. Driving simulators save school districts approximately $38 per student because several students can be served simultaneously by one teacher.

Employing these cost-saving techniques, the school districts have been able to keep the cost of driver education down. The estimated statewide average cost of driver education was $145 in 1983-84.

D. Funding

School districts receive no designated state funds for driver education.

E. Teacher Certification

A driver education teacher is required to have a driver education endorsement added to a current Texas teacher's certificate. The endorsement requires 6 semester hours of training from a university approved for this specific area of specialization. One of the two courses may be a general safety course that is not directly related to a traffic safety course.

Paraprofessionals (teaching assistants) are allowed to teach in the laboratory phase (driving simulator and/or in-car instruction) of driver education. A teaching assistant must complete a 184 clock hour or 9 semester hour program to be certified. The Central Education Agency has developed specific guidelines for the training and use of paraprofessionals in driver education. Paraprofessionals may be trained by education service centers, school districts, and universities.

F. Scheduling

The driver education course may be taught during the regular day, before and after school, and in the summer. The time requirements in the present course amount to less than a semester's work, so it may not count as one of the state-required units for graduation. Only local credit may be given for driver education.

Current standards make provision for expanding the course and allowing for semester programs. In fact, many of the large school districts have gone to semester driver education programs to avoid scheduling conflicts and to provide a comprehensive program for their students.

A Comprehensive Driver Education Curriculum

Course of Study

High School driver education is designed to prepare vehicle operators for the complex traffic environment that exists today. The Course of Study is divided into two phases: classroom phase and laboratory phase. The classroom phase consists of 56 hours of instruction and the laboratory requires 7 hours of in-car instruction. However, three hours of in-car may be substituted with simulation.

1. Classroom Phase

Upon completion of the classroom phase, the student will demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of:

a. The driver, the passenger, and the pedestrian

(1) the purpose of driver education
(2) the good driver
(3) factors affecting physical characteristics of the driver
(4) driver and pedestrian precautions

b. Alcohol and drugs

(1) use and abuse of alcohol
(2) the facts and decisions about drinking
(3) decisions faced during alcohol-related situations
(4) your decision about drinking and driving
(5) other drugs

c. The automobile and preventive maintenance

(1) essential functions of the automobile system
(2) maintaining the auto for safe operation

d. Highway characteristics and engineering controls

(1) participation of the public in highway planning and construction
(2) highway characteristics
(3) highway and traffic engineering

e. Physical laws

(1) inertia
(2) friction
(3) gravity
(4) centrifugal force

(5) momentum
(6) kinetic energy
(7) acceleration
(8) deceleration
(9) summary of physical laws

f. Occupant protection

(1) lap and shoulder belts
(2) passive restraints
(3) automatic belt-restraint systems
(4) child restraints
(5) misconceptions concerning seat belt use

g. Motor vehicle traffic laws

(1) preceding, overtaking, and passing; restrictions on divided and controlled-access highways
(2) special stops and restricted speeds
(3) traffic signs, signals, and markings
(4) pedestrian's rights and duties
(5) responsibilities of those involved in an accident and safety responsibility law

h. IPDE driving strategies

(1) identify
(2) predict
(3) decide
(4) execute

i. Driving procedures

(1) getting ready to drive
(2) intersections, right-of-way, and signals
(3) turning and parking
(4) city driving
(5) rural driving
(6) freeway driving (controlled-access highways)
(7) night driving
(8) driving under adverse conditions
(9) evasive driving techniques
(10) driving to conserve energy

j. Accident avoidance

(1) procedures to follow when stopped by a law enforcement officer
(2) types of collisions
(3) accident reporting requirements

k. Emergency procedures and first aid for traffic accidents

(1) identifying procedures to follow at an accident scene
(2) treatment of bleeding, shock, and stoppage of breathing
(3) controlling an accident scene
(4) cardiopulmonary resuscitation

l. The two-wheeled vehicle in the traffic pattern

(1) motorcycles
(2) bicycles

m. The driver as a consumer

(1) purchasing an automobile
(2) insuring an automobile
(3) trip planning
(4) achieving fuel economy

n. The national and state traffic safety program

(1) the National Highway Safety Act
(2) the Texas Traffic Safety Act
(3) current issues and programs

2. Laboratory Phase

Upon completion of the laboratory phase, the student will demonstrate the skills and ability to perform the required tasks to safely operate a motor vehicle listed in the following:

a. Through driving simulation

(1) introduction to simulation and the driver compartment
(2) basic maneuvering tasks
(3) driving procedures in light traffic
(4) perceptual development
(5) decision making in the more complex driving environment
(6) highway driving
(7) complex city traffic
(8) freeway driving
(9) driving emergencies
(10) special driving situations
(11) manual shift
(12) review and evaluation

b. Through multiple-car driving range

(1) procedures for starting, stopping, and backing
(2) procedures for steering
(3) procedures for left and right turns

(4) procedures for proper lane position and lane changing
(5) T-exercise, 3-point turn, and X-exercise
(6) figure eight and garage exercise
(7) procedures for parking
(8) procedures for turnabouts
(9) procedures for parking on an upgrade and a downgrade
(10) procedures for driving a standard shift
(11) procedures for overtaking and passing

c. Through in-car instruction

(1) elementary driving
(2) city driving
(3) rural and/or freeway driving

Driver Education Instructor Training
Recommended Course Content

A. Driver and Traffic Safety I

Students will be given the opportunity to examine the curricular and instructional aspects of classroom and on-street driver and traffic safety education. Emphasis will be given to selected methods of instruction. Critical issues related to driver and traffic safety education will also be explored.

1. Background and goals of driver and traffic safety education
2. Developing and using performance objectives in the classroom
3. Developing and using lesson plans in the classroom
4. Analysis of multimedia techniques
5. Scheduling classroom instruction
6. Interpreting driver and traffic safety education issues
7. Classroom evaluation
8. Classroom administration
9. On-street instruction techniques
10. On-street evaluation measures

B. Driver and Traffic Safety II

Driver and Traffic Safety II provides practicum experiences in teaching the classroom and on-street phases of driver education. Attention is also devoted to administration of two-phase driver education programs.

1. Development and implementation of daily classroom lesson plans
2. Integration of instructional aids in the classroom phases
3. Use of psychophysical testing equipment
4. Use of perceptual development activities in the classroom
5. Handling of student learning and discipline problems
6. Administration and interpretation of written tests

7. Maintenance of a record and reporting system

8. Development and implementation of on-street lesson plans in rural, city, and freeway areas

9. Demonstration of on-street teaching techniques (commentary driving, use of mirrors, verbal cues, etc.)

10. Demonstration of observer involvement techniques

11. Administration of on-street tests

12. Maintenance of on-street student driving records

13. Development of schedules for two-phase programs

14. Administrative and financial tasks involved in two-phase program

15. Techniques for evaluation of two-phase program

C. Driver and Traffic Safety Education III

Driver and Traffic Safety Education III provides analysis of the content, procedures, and administration of multiphase driver and traffic safety education programs.

1. Role of simulation and multiple-car methods in driving task instruction

2. Policies for multi-phase programs

3. Schedules of multi-phase programs

4. Instruction in multi-phase programs

5. Operation and maintenance of simulation and multi-car equipment

6. Simulation and multi-car instruction techniques

7. Records system for multi-phase program

8. Specifications for simulation and multi-car facilities

9. State and national policies for simulation and multi-car instruction

10. Selection of simulators and multi-car equipment

11. Development of simulation and multi-car lesson plans

12. Simulation and multi-car student teaching experiences

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

TITLE VI, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964; THE MODIFIED COURT ORDER, CIVIL ACTION 5281, FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, TYLER DIVISION

Reviews of local education agencies pertaining to compliance with Title VI Civil Rights Act of 1964 and with specific requirements of the Modified Court Order, Civil Action No. 5281, Federal District Court, Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division are conducted periodically by staff representatives of the Texas Education Agency. These reviews cover at least the following policies and practices:

(1) acceptance policies on student transfers from other school districts,

(2) operation of school bus routes or runs on a non-segregated basis,

(3) nondiscrimination in extracurricular activities and the use of school facilities,

(4) nondiscriminatory practices in the hiring, assigning, promoting, paying, demoting, reassigning, or dismissing of faculty and staff members who work with children,

(5) enrollment and assignment of students without discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin;

(6) nondiscriminatory practices relating to the use of a student's first language, and

(7) evidence of published procedures for hearing complaints and grievances.

In addition to conducting reviews, the Texas Education Agency staff representatives check complaints of discrimination made by a citizen or citizens residing in a school district where it is alleged discriminatory practices have occurred or are occurring.

Where a violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act is found, the findings are reported to the Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

If there is a direct violation of the Court Order in Civil Action No. 5281 that cannot be cleared through negotiation, the sanctions required by the Court Order are applied.

TITLE VII, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964; EXECUTIVE ORDERS 11246 AND 11375; TITLE IX, 1973 EDUCATION AMENDMENTS; REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973 AS AMENDED; 1974 AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGE-HOUR LAW EXPANDING THE AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967; AND VIETNAM ERA VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972 AS AMENDED IN 1974.

It is the policy of the Texas Education Agency to comply fully with the nondiscrimination provisions of all federal and state laws and regulations by assuring that no person shall be excluded from consideration for recruitment, selection, appointment, training, promotion, retention, or any other personnel action, or be denied any benefits or participation in any programs or activities which it operates on the grounds of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, handicap, age, or veteran status (except where age, sex, or handicap constitute a bona fide occupational qualification necessary to proper and efficient administration). The Texas Education Agency makes positive efforts to employ and advance in employment all protected groups.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE